IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

TUESDAY, THE SECOND DAY OF NOVEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

-

WRIT PETITION No.18521 of 2000

Between:

Miriyala Rama Rao S/o.Veeraswamy, aged about 69 years,
Occ: Business, R/o.57-14-17, Patamata St.2,Vijayawada-6.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 Municipal Corporation of Vijayawada Rep. by its Commissioner,

Vijayawada Municipal Corporation, Vijayawada.
2 The Vijayawada-Guntur-Tenali Urban Development Authority Rep.by

its Vice Chairman cum Managing Director,Vijayawada, Krishna District.
3 Director of Town Planning, Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue a writ or writs more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the respondents in trying to lay the 80' feet wide road through northern portion of my property being Municipal No:57-14-17, on plot.No.2 in R.S.No.141/5, situated at Patamata, Vijayawada and forcibly deviating the L.P.No:409/79 on L.P.No.32/92 VGT UDA and without following any due process of law is illegal, arbitrary highhanded and cannot be justified in the eye of land and consequently direct the respondents not to lay any above said property belongs to petitioner without following any due process of law.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.CH.SRINIVAS

Counsel for the Respondent No.1: MR. T.S. VENKATA RAMANA, Standing Counsel for Vijayawada Municipal Corporation

Counsel for the Respondent No.2: MR.P.M.GOPAL RAO

Counsel for the Respondent No.3: None appeared.

The Court made the following:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION NO.18521 OF 2000

ORDER:

This matter has been coming high-up in the list. On 26.10.2004, when the matter was called, learned counsel for the petitioner was absent and there was no representation. Therefore, the Court directed the matter to be listed on 02.11.2004, under the caption 'For Dismissal'. Today when the matter is called, though the matter is listed under the caption 'For Dismissal', none appears. Learned counsel for the petitioner is absent and there is no representation, though the list was circulated was circulated to the learned counsel well in advance.

The writ petition, therefore, is dismissed for default/ non-prosecution.

_____

(V.V.S.RAO,J)

02.11.2004.

pln

To

1 The Commissioner, Municipal Corporation of Vijayawada,

Vijayawada Municipal Corporation, Vijayawada.
2 The Vice Chairman cum Managing Director, Vijayawada-Guntur-Tenali

Urban Development Authority Vijayawada, Krishna District.
3 The Director of Town Planning, Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad.

4 Two C.D. Copies.